Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:18 p.m. Present were Chair, Joan Duff, members Vincent Chiozzi, Jay Doherty, Eric Macaux (arrived at 7:21 p.m.), Lelani Loder, and associate member Zach Bergeron; also present were Paul Materazzo, Director of Planning, Lisa Schwarz, Senior Planner, and Jacki Byerley, Town Planner.

The Legends – Minor Modification:

Ms. Duff opened the public meeting on The Legends for a minor modification to a Special Permit. Mr. Doherty recused himself from the meeting and left the room. Doug Lees of Land Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. representing Yvon Cormier and CA Investment Trust addressed the Board regarding a proposed minor modification to The Legends multi-family project that was approved in 2007 as two Phases and modified twice in 2009. It has come to the developer's attention that a unit on Building 6, once built, will be in the way of golf balls on the 13th fairway. The best way to remedy this is to drop the end unit off of the building and rotate it away from the fairway. The roads and utilities for the building are already in place. Mr. Lees has received comments from DPW on the plans regarding the location of fire hydrants and he has updated the plans with the correct locations. Mr. Lees met with Dave Dargie of the DPW and Mr. Dargie approved the revised locations of the fire hydrants. He had questions on the timing of the remainder of the work, including the placement of sidewalks, and asked for annual inspection reports. Mr. Lees informed Mr. Dargie that weekly inspection reports are already being done based on requirements from the Conservation Commission. The entire road is to binder coat and Mr. Lees agreed to patch the road from where utilities have previously been put in and the pavement has sunk.

Ms. Byerley asked Mr. Lees to point out which buildings have already been constructed. He showed two buildings that are complete, one that is under construction now and the location of the proposed Building 6. Ms. Byerley let the Board know that the modification plans went out to all departments for comment and only the DPW had comments. Most of DPW's requests are items that need to be resolved prior to full occupancy based on the initial permit that was issued. Ms. Byerley stated that fire hydrants need to be in place but all other items can wait until final occupancy of all buildings. Mr. Macaux questioned if anything else needs to be nailed down prior to final occupancy. Ms. Byerley noted that the conditions in the original Special Permit always stay in effect and should take care of safety issues at the site. Mr. Cormier is very responsive when you do request something to be cleaned up or fixed. Mr. Lees let the Board know that Muirfield Circle is to binder coat and in good shape. Crenshaw Circle is a mess right now because of construction that is underway. They have already put in a lot of curbing and are trying to keep the area clean because units are on the market and are being shown to potential buyers. Ms. Duff questioned if the addition to the common area would continue to be common area. Mr. Lees answered that it would. Ms. Byerley let the Board know that they had received an explanation of limited common area, common common area and the golf course area in their packet.

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Ms. Loder, the Board moved to determine that the request submitted by CA Investment Trust is a minor modification because it does not change the scope and nature of the original permit and cause the project to be non-compliant with the

The Legends – Minor Modification (cont'd):

Zoning Bylaw. **Vote:** (4-0-1). Joan Duff, Vincent Chiozzi, Eric Macaux and Lelani Loder voting yes and Jay Doherty abstaining from voting.

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Mr. Chiozzi, the Board moved to approve the modification for elimination of one unit and reconfiguration of Building 6 as shown on the plans titled "Minor Modification Plan The Legends Phase 1" last revised February 2013. This approval will require the submission of an updated Master Deed, Condominium Owners' Association and other documents associated with the common areas with all other conditions of approval for SP06-07 and SP09-10 in full force and effect. **Vote:** (4-0-1). Joan Duff, Vincent Chiozzi, Eric Macaux and Lelani Loder voting yes and Jay Doherty abstaining from voting.

Warrant Articles 2013 Town Meeting:

Preliminary Warrant Article P-61- Watershed Protection Overlay District Establishment
It should be noted that Mr. Doherty reentered the room. Ms. Duff opened the public hearings that were continued from the February 26, 2013 meeting for the proposed Preliminary Warrant Article P-61 to see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw Section 8.1.2 Watershed Protection Overlay District Establishment by amending the reference to the plan. Ms. Byerley brought the Board's attention to the map on display and explained the boundaries of the overlay district. On the map, the purple line outlines the area that is the current watershed protection overlay district, and that is not changing, the red line is the delineation of the Fish Brook and Haggetts Pond areas that are described in the bylaw and are now being shown on the map, and the blue is the tributaries. She noted that nothing is being added, and the only thing taken away is an area that was voted previously at Town Meeting to be taken away.

On a motion by Ms. Loder, seconded by Mr. Macaux, the Board moved to close the public hearing for Preliminary Warrant Article P-61 Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment to Section 8.1.2 Watershed Protection Overlay District Establishment. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

On a motion by Ms. Loder, seconded by Mr. Macaux, the Board moved to recommend approval for Preliminary Warrant Article P-61 Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment to Section 8.1.2 Watershed Protection Overlay District Establishment as written in the warrant. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

Preliminary Warrant Article P-43 - Parking Management Action Plan

Ms. Duff opened the public hearing for the proposed Preliminary Warrant Article P-43 to see if the Town will vote to raise by taxation, borrowing or transfer from available funds and appropriate the sum of \$18,000 to develop a Parking Management Action Plan for downtown Andover. Andrea Leary of the Economic Development Council explained that a Parking Management Assessment would be helpful in looking at opportunities for infill development in the downtown area. This assessment would involve hiring a consultant to look at past studies, revenues and expenses associated with the current parking system and review new survey information that can be developed by the EDC and planning staff this spring. This assessment is necessary to build on information the Town already has to get recommendations to maximize efficiency, improve the customer experience and present opportunities for business growth and uses in the downtown area. Mr. Materazzo informed the Board that by using a consultant, the

Warrant Articles 2013 - Parking Management Action Plan (cont'd):

Town has an opportunity to learn the best practices of other communities, and can set the table for what the next step is to further improve the parking situation. Ms. Leary stated she has met with the Police Chief and he is in agreement that an assessment would be helpful to identify the next steps and find out exactly what the needs are to get the most efficient and effective parking. Their goal is to keep a stream of revenue coming in, in a fair and equitable way, while encouraging businesses to stay in and come to Andover. Jeff Spagat of the EDC informed the Board that a full scale traffic study is very expensive at about \$80,000 - \$100,000, but Andover already has most of the data it needs.

Ms. Loder asked if the last parking assessment was performed in 1987, and Mr. Doherty asked what was done with the information from that assessment. Ms. Schwarz answered that the last full blown study was performed in 1987 and changes were made based on it. Some of these changes include meters being removed from Main Street and the implementation of the parking sticker program. She also informed the Board that right now the parking sticker program has a wait list, so this assessment can help in determining if there is room to add additional stickers. The Police Department and Planning Department have done micro studies in the interim. The goal now is to bring all of that data as well as any data from studies performed by the ABCA and the EDC and come up with future solutions. Mr. Bergeron questioned how certain they are that the data they have is viable and relevant. Mr. Materazzo and Ms. Schwarz answered that the data is from an extensive study that was performed by planning staff within the last few years for a proposed zoning change to the off-street parking requirements for the downtown. Ms. Duff noted that she felt it was very important to look at what can be done for employee parking in the downtown area. Ms. Leary stated that the price of this study is very reasonable considering that the consultant is well known and has offices throughout the country. Ms. Loder asked if parking questions were included on the resident survey from 2012. Ms. Schwarz answered that she could not remember, but the consultant provided an example of surveys that could be given on the parking. Mr. Macaux noted that parking is part of the economic infrastructure and for a while the Town was on a 5-year track of parking studies, so this assessment would be very helpful. Ms. Duff questioned is \$18,000 will be sufficient for what they want to do. Ms. Schwarz answered that the data gathering aspect of a study is normally very costly, but Andover has an inhouse ability to perform the field work of tagging and counting. Ms. Leary reiterated that this is not a study; it is an assessment to look at what Andover has, how it is being used, and what plans can be made for the future. Ms. Loder asked if they have considered polling residents through a forum like the Townsman. Ms. Leary stated that they have considered putting a piece in the Townsman as well as a poll on the Town website to market the assessment. She also feels that there needs to be an education campaign within the business community to let them know how this study will benefit them because employee parking is a real issue. Ms. Duff added that Andover is very walkable and it is not too far for people to drive from the CVS to the Library. Ms. Leary noted that as part of this they will be looking at improvements to pedestrian access. Mr. Doherty added that parking has been a lifelong problem in Andover; even after the study it will still be a problem, the voters' needs to be assured that this will be followed through on. Ms. Byerley added that the number of parking spaces will not change; it is more of pedestrian access and information on where parking is available for employees and visitors to downtown.

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Mr. Doherty, the Board voted to recommend for approval Warrant Article P-43 to see if the Town will vote to raise by taxation, borrowing or

Warrant Articles 2013 - Parking Management Action Plan (cont'd):

transfer from available funds and appropriate the sum of \$18,000 to develop a Parking Management Action Plan for downtown Andover. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

Preliminary Warrant Articles P-51, P-52 and P-53 - ID2 District

Ms. Duff opened the public hearing for the proposed Preliminary Warrant Articles P-51, P-52 and P-53 to see if the Town will Amend Article VIII, Section 2.1 of the Zoning Bylaw by adding at the end of Section 2.1, ID2 – Industrial District and amending the Zoning Map to establish and ID2 District as shown on the plan titled, "Proposed Zoning District ID2 Dascomb Road" and "Proposed Zoning District ID2 River Road."

Mr. Materazzo informed the Board that this proposed warrant article is a collaboration with the Economic Development Council, Green Advisory Board, the Planning Board and Planning staff. Initially all of the ID districts were looked at for this zoning change to see if there was a market or a need for additional uses in industrial areas. A working group was established and the Northern area of River Road and the triangular piece of Dascomb Road between Route 93 and the Tewksbury town line, seemed most suitable because they did not infringe on residential districts. The warrant article is proposing nine additional uses in these areas by Planning Board Special Permit. These uses are personal service establishment, retail sales establishment, convenience store, medical center or clinic, dry-cleaning operation, sit-down restaurant, fast-food restaurant, indoor commercial recreation establishment and grocery store. Mr. Materazzo noted that a lot of people were disappointed when Market Basket left Town and have asked what can be done to bring them back. Unfortunately Andover does not have enough land right now that is zoned appropriately to bring a grocery store to Town. This zoning change would create a line item for grocery stores that would allow them to respond to the market and potentially move forward in these two areas of Town. Mr. Materazzo outlined the additional Special Permit Criteria that will coincide with the standard Special Permit Criteria to control development. These additional four Special Permit Criteria call for all development to have a positive impact on the Town, be consistent with the Town's Master Plan, not be detrimental to the downtown business district and be consistent with the character of the district so that it is compatible with the surrounding community and abutters. To facilitate this process, any proposed development will have to go before the Design Review Board to make sure that the building fits in with the character of the community. The Board will have the authority under the bylaw to require landscape buffering, and traffic mitigation to make sure the development doesn't adversely impact a nearby street network. Ms. Materazzo reviewed pictures of what would and what would not be allowed.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the 25,000 s.f. limitation was per user and Mr. Materazzo confirmed that it is a hard cap at 25,000 s.f. per user for retail sales establishment. Mr. Doherty asked for an example of a 25,000 s.f. business. Ms. Schwarz answered that the old Market Basket in Shawsheen Plaza was around 35,000 s.f. and the Marshalls was 25,000 s.f. Mr. Materazzo assured the Board that the scale and size would not allow for a superstore. Mr. Doherty noted that the current industrial parks are set back far from River Road. He questioned if developers would be able to put something right on the street in the River Road area. Mr. Materazzo answered that the criteria may call for additional landscaping, or the Board could find that the proposed development doesn't fit into the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Macaux added

Warrant Articles 2013 – ID2 District (cont'd):

that setback requirements are already in place. Mr. Materazzo noted that he has been fielding calls from medical providers and feels that a lot of the development will be in preexisting buildings as opposed to new construction.

Ms. Duff stated that there should be some criteria in place that measures how something could be detrimental to the downtown area to protect the smaller shops. Mr. Spagat informed the Board that shop owners in downtown have come out to support the article. He also noted that in a similar situation, Legacy Place, a shopping mall in Dedham, which was built one mile from its Main Street was supported by Main Street businesses and now those businesses are profiting from the extra people who come to the neighborhood. Ms. Schwarz added that the Andover Business Center Association feels that the River Road area is too far away to have an impact on the downtown. The ABCA is happy for the potential of more people coming to the community.

Lynne Robidoux of 21 Brundrett Avenue addressed the Board regarding her concerns with the ID2 District in the River Road area. She stated that in 1959-1960 when the Town decided to change residential land to ID land special rules were put into place to protect the residents who live there. She feels that the people that work in that area do not need extra amenities and noted that there is a Market Basket 1.75 miles from the industrial park. She is concerned that if this passes, in the future the zoning will extend to the industrial land that she owns on the south side of River Road. She feels that the Planning Board has historically not protected residents based on the proximity of residences to industrial buildings and the fact that spot zoning was used in the past for a bank against abutters' wishes. The bank was supposed to be a great amenity for the workers in the industrial park, but the bank was robbed numerous times, eventually closed and is now an office building. Ms. Duff asked Ms. Robidoux what the specific protections she is referring to are. Ms. Robidoux answered that the protections are the setbacks, which will change if these new uses are approved, and that the buildings will become closer to people's homes. She also stated that there were to be protections against fast-food restaurants and all of the other amenities proposed because it was supposed to be a high tech area. The promise of a high tech area is what got the zoning changed, and empty buildings are not the residents' problem. She also stated that the Minuteman Road/Shattuck Road/River Road intersection is very dangerous, and back in the 1970s when the industry was starting to be built up, the Police Department filed a report with the Town stating that it was a very dangerous intersection. She noted that services can be made available to the workers by the owners of the buildings through in-house cafeterias and work out centers and courier drycleaners. Ms. Robidoux added that in the area of 147 River Road, residents cannot get in or out, and the area has been has been rated an "F," the worse possible traffic rating. Ms. Duff stated that she lives off of River Road and travels the road every day and has not noted a problem in that area. Ms. Robidoux said that traffic studies done for the proposed 40B on Shattuck Road prove that traffic is terrible in that area as well as on Route 93 and nothing can be done to fix it.

Mr. Bergeron asked what the assurances for the residents are and if the criteria calls for traffic review. Mr. Materazzo answered that part of any development in that area, whether it be for one of these proposed new uses or not, would have to go through a stringent traffic review. If any project were to cause an extreme increase in traffic that could not be mitigated, the Board would have to disapprove the project. Ms. Robidoux stated that we are already at the point where the

Warrant Articles 2013 – ID2 District (cont'd):

traffic cannot be improved because it is at an "F." Andrea Leary, Executive Director of the Merrimack Valley Transportation Management Association informed the Board that a traffic rating of "F" can most definitely be improved through mitigation.

Mr. Chiozzi questioned why the land originally changed from residential to industrial. Mr. Materazzo answered that the land was originally farmland that was rezoned in the late 1950s when I-93 was being built. Ms. Schwarz added that zoning did not exist until the late 1940s and the area was previously farm land. Ms. Loder asked if the current conditions of the time when the original zoning change took place were what drove the change to industrial. Ms. Schwarz answered that at that time people were putting factories next to houses. The 1957 Master Plan felt that if zoning was to be put in place, there were certain areas of Town that were best for that segregated use. Setting apart the areas of Town next to the newly constructed highways as the areas for manufacturing seemed appropriate. Over time manufacturing has differentiated itself from research and development and the uses have separated out and are not as toxic as they were in the 1930s-1950s. This change would help modify what defines industrial. There are some uses included in this that are not industrial at all, they are more commercial/retail to make more of a mix of uses in the area.

Richard Robidoux of of 21 Brundrett Avenue gave the Board a letter that was written opposing the rezoning by an abutter, Adele LaFrenier, of 8 Laurel Road who could not make it to this hearing. The letter was read aloud by Ms. Schwarz and entered into the public record.

Jeff Spagat of the Economic Development Council informed that Board that over the last 50 years, these types of areas have started to include retail and restaurants. The vacancy rate in the River Road area is increasing because business parks in other cities and towns like Burlington are adding amenities such as Starbucks and Panera to their building lobbies. There are an existing 12,000 workers in the River Road area that are serviced by a small Dunkin Donuts in a gas station, a Chili's and a Chateau. Ms. Leary added that the EDC has a goal of a vibrant Andover with a commercial tax base that can help support necessary projects like educational facilities. Any project needs to be cognizant of traffic concerns and considerations and there are obviously constraints built into this amendment. This amendment is trying to be responsible to the Town and its residents including its business residents, to see how economic development can be supported.

Ms. Robidoux questioned how much tax money the industrial businesses brought in compared to residences. The Board informed her that industry brought in a great deal of money. She asked if it was more than the residences and they assured her it was. Mr. Materazzo stated that when businesses leave town their taxes also leave town. This is an opportunity to provide extra amenities that will retain businesses as well as attract new businesses to keep the tax base stable. Ms. Robidoux stated that she was concerned of what legal loopholes could be found in the zoning that could overrule any protections that are put in place for the residents. Ms. Duff stated that things are evolving and changing, and there is an opportunity to keep business here and bring new business into the empty industrial park buildings. No one wants to do anything detrimental to our neighborhoods; however it is a choice of all of the residents of Andover through Town Meeting vote.

Warrant Articles 2013 – ID2 District (cont'd):

Mr. Materazzo asked Ms. Loder, in her professional opinion as a Property Manager for Cummings Properties, what businesses are attracted to and if this is where the market is going. Ms. Loder answered that the trend is to take empty office buildings and put a restaurant on the first floor which will draw businesses to the other floors. Ms. Robidoux asked if there were homes around the businesses and Ms. Loder answered in there were homes within a stone's throw from the businesses and there is buffering by fences and shrubbery. Ms. Robidoux asked what the Town will do about drugs or prostitution at hotels or business parks like what is currently happening at the La Quinta. Ms. Loder answered that controlling undesirable activities falls on the management of the buildings. She did agree that anything new will have kinks that will need to be worked out. She noted that the residents have much to gain with the new amenities that are offered, and the office parks would not still be in business if they had angry residents all around them. Ms. Robidoux asked what the dimensional requirements would be for the ID2 District. Mr. Materazzo then reviewed the dimensional requirements and the proposed changes in use. Ms. Robidoux stated that in her eyes there is not much of a difference between an office building and a medical building, but a McDonalds, Starbucks and Dunkin Donuts are hang out places. Ms. Loder stated that any use would rely on its management company to properly oversee their property and contact police with regards to any issues. Mr. Macaux added that the criteria should offer protection to area residents, and that is why there are specific criteria that it fit into the character of the neighborhood and it go before the Design Review Board. These criteria will make the area attractive to become revitalized without inviting unattractive elements. Ms. Loder noted that the residents could look at this as an opportunity to have their own properties improved by what will be going into the parks by adding fencing or shrubbery that they do not currently have at someone else's cost. She noted that traffic mitigation was a requirement for the proposed 40B on Shattuck Road.

Ms. Robidoux questioned if the rezoning would allow certain parcels to now have buildings on them such as a certain parcel on River Road that is currently a triangle of green. Mr. Macaux assured her that as part of the Special Permit process, the Board always requires the applicant to submit landscape plans for approval. Ms. Robidoux noted that right now on Minuteman there are large berms that do a great job of shielding the residences from the industrial buildings, which was part of the special protections for the homeowners. Ms. Duff relayed that landscaping plans and traffic mitigation plans all have to be brought to the Board and negotiated with the developer.

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Mr. Doherty, the Board voted to continue the public hearings on Preliminary Warrant Articles P-51, P-52 and P-53 to see if the Town will Amend Article VIII, Section 2.1 of the Zoning Bylaw by adding at the end of Section 2.1, ID2 – Industrial District and amending the Zoning Map to establish and ID2 District as shown on the plan titled, "Proposed Zoning District ID2 Dascomb Road" and "Proposed Zoning District ID2 River Road" to Wednesday, March 27th at 7:30p.m. at the Public Safety Center. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

<u>Preliminary Warrant Articles P-54 and P-55 - Andover Transit Oriented Development District</u>
Ms. Duff opened the public hearing for the proposed Preliminary Warrant Articles P-54 and

Warrant Articles 2013 - Andover Transit Oriented Development District (cont'd):

P-55 to see if the Town will add a new Section 8.7 Andover Transit Oriented Development District and if the Town will Amend Section 2.2 (Overlay Districts) by adding at the end of Section 2.2, Andover Transit Oriented Development District and amending the Zoning Map to establish an "Andover Transit Oriented Development District."

Mr. Materazzo gave an overview of the area and an outline of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment which would provide for consistent overlay for redevelopment in the acreage surrounding the Town Yard. This would create a uniform zoning district which would tie the SRA, Mixed Use and General Business Districts under one cohesive overlay zoning code to enhance the asset of the Town Yard which is a site that is assessed at \$3.3 million.

Mr. Materazzo showed graphics of what the area could look if this overlay was put in place and stated that with the design standards they are trying to create an Andover-centric feel with density and height. Mr. Macaux clarified that the heights allowed follow the slope of the land and questioned if limiting the heights at 60 ft would be sufficient to attract a developer. Mr. Materazzo responded that there are a number of developers that are just waiting for the Town to put this piece of land up for sale and the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Affairs will be conducting a bus tour of the Merrimack Valley for potential developers. Four areas of Andover are on the tour with the Town Yard area being a priority area for the state and the first stop on the tour. Mr. Chiozzi asked if there was an update on the relocation of the Town Yard. Mr. Materazzo informed him that the Selectmen are looking at this vote as a referendum on if the Town Yard should be moved or rebuilt at its current location. The cost to rebuild at the current location is estimated to be +/- \$20.5 million. The current property is 3 acres and studies have shown that the minimum amount of land necessary to build a Town Yard for the size of Andover is 6 acres. Mr. Materazzo stated that the question for the voters is do they want to spend money downtown on a site that is too small that otherwise could provide value to the community and enhance the community's experience, or move, sell the land, and use that money as a down payment for the new Town Yard, in addition to the new tax growth that would come with this parcel.

Mr. Macaux asked what the total cost is to build the facility that the Town needs at the Town Yard site, because that site is only 3 acres, and a proper Town Yard would require 6 acres of land. Mr. Bergeron asked if the cost to build on a new site is \$18.5 million. Mr. Materazzo answered that the cost to build in entirety is \$18.5 million, but it could always be built in phases. Mr. Macaux felt that the residents need to know what the cost difference is to rebuild a facility at the current Town Yard that meets all of the needs of the Town or the cost to move to a new location. The Board then discussed the Selectmen's referendum and Mr. Materazzo noted that most people who attended the public meetings on this proposed amendment had minimal interest in the zoning aspect and cared more about where the Town Yard would go and contamination at the site. A local LSP has been contracted and they have stated that the cleanup will be minimal because the contamination is oil and their estimated price of a cleanup is \$250,000 - \$1.5 million.

Steve Fink, 26 Bateson Drive, a member of Sustainable Andover noted that he felt rezoning the area will benefit the Town in three distinct ways; it will bring in more money for the Town, benefit education and help the environment. Studies have shown that people who live in these

Warrant Articles 2013 – Andover Transit Oriented Development District (cont'd):

types of developments get a lot of cars off of the highways because they take the train. A parking garage close to the train station would also take a significant amount of cars off of the road. A development will allow baby boomers to downsize, stay in Town and access downtown without needing a car. He also noted that in the areas of Newburyport, Lincoln, Concord and the Back Bay there is similar redevelopment that has improved property values. This project could also lead to project based learning for local students. There needs to be more talk about all of the wonderful aspects of this amendment besides just moving a Town Yard.

Andrea Leary of the Economic Development Council added that being able to put a mixed use area so close to a train station is an amazing, valuable opportunity for the Town. Research has show that the majority of the people who live in transit oriented developments are young professionals and people looking to downsize. These people will spend $3/5^{ths}$ of their disposable income in the community, and 40% of those who are of working age will take the train to work. The EDC is not taking a position on the Town Yard move, their position is that this area is an asset that the Town has and if you can reconfigure how it is being used it can bring tremendous value to the Town in all ways.

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Mr. Doherty, the Board moved to close the public hearing for Preliminary Warrant Articles P-54 and P-55 to see if the Town will add a new Section 8.7 Andover Transit Oriented Development District and if the Town will Amend Section 2.2 (Overlay Districts) by adding at the end of Section 2.2, Andover Transit Oriented Development District and amending the Zoning Map to establish an "Andover Transit Oriented Development District." **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

On a motion by Mr. Macaux, seconded by Mr. Doherty, the Board moved to recommend approval for Preliminary Warrant Articles P-54 and P-55 to see if the Town will add a new Section 8.7 Andover Transit Oriented Development District and if the Town will Amend Section 2.2 (Overlay Districts) by adding at the end of Section 2.2, Andover Transit Oriented Development District and amending the Zoning Map to establish an "Andover Transit Oriented Development District" as written in the warrant. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m.